

Report on the Master  
Advanced Studies in International  
Children's Rights  
Leiden Law School



**Universiteit  
Leiden**  
The Netherlands

Site visit: 4-7 March 2024

Date final report: 23 September 2024

# Content

1.	Summary .....	4
2.	Introduction .....	6
2.1.	<i>Assessment framework</i> .....	6
2.2.	<i>Panel</i> .....	6
2.3.	<i>Approach</i> .....	6
2.4.	<i>Working Method</i> .....	6
3.	Characteristics of the programme .....	8
3.1.	<i>Administrative data</i> .....	8
3.2.	<i>Organisation</i> .....	8
3.3.	<i>Recommendations previous assessment</i> .....	8
4.	Strong points .....	9
5.	Recommendations .....	10
6.	Assessment .....	11
	Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes.....	12
	<i>Findings and considerations</i> .....	12
	<i>Conclusion</i> .....	14
	Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment .....	15
	<i>Findings and considerations</i> .....	15
	<i>Conclusion</i> .....	20
	Standard 3: Student assessment.....	21
	<i>Findings and considerations</i> .....	21
	<i>Conclusion</i> .....	23
	Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes.....	24
	<i>Findings and considerations</i> .....	24
	<i>Conclusion</i> .....	25
7.	Appendices.....	26
	<i>Appendix 1: Intended Learning Outcomes</i> .....	27
	<i>Appendix 2: Schematic overview of the curriculum</i> .....	28
	<i>Appendix 3: Documents studied</i> .....	29
	<i>Appendix 4: Site visit schedule</i> .....	30

# 1. Summary

The panel describes the Master Advanced Studies International Children's Rights as an extremely strong programme due to its highly varied, flexible and cutting-edge content. The programme especially stands out for its staff, who are academic specialists with impressive professional experiences as well. Students are generally positive about the programme and the additional activities offered, such as conferences, guest lectures or visits to institutions like UNICEF/study trips.

## Standard 1

The panel concludes that the general direction and ambition of the programme correspond to labour market needs and equips graduates to pursue a further career in academia, should they wish to do so. Furthermore, the panel finds that there is a very clear tie-in between the ILOs and the programme level and orientation.

Also, the panel appreciates that the programme makes conscientious and active efforts to stay ahead of the curve and keep the programme up to date, which is of critical importance given the fast-evolving nature of international children's rights.

A general recommendation for all Advanced Studies LLM programmes is to formulate a clear definition of what the 'advanced' label at Leiden Law School entails. Leiden Law School is recommended to make certain that it becomes a shared definition to make it a strong(er) label, to ensure consistent messaging towards all stakeholders, to more clearly distinguish the level of the courses and the output of students in relation to the regular LLM programmes, and to be able to manage the expectations of prospective students accordingly.

## Standard 2

The curriculum of the Advanced Studies LLM programme ICR reflects the ILOs of the programme. The panel finds that ICR adeptly integrates advanced academic knowledge with practical skills, preparing students for a variety of career paths in international children's rights law. Its unique focus, coupled with an interdisciplinary approach and a diverse,

international classroom environment, enhances students' understanding of children's rights from an international, global and regional perspective and prepares them for complex real-world challenges.

The programme is feasible, but students report that the workload, especially with regards to reading materials, is (too) high. The panel recommends that the programme explores ways to reduce the (experienced) workload. The teaching staff is well-qualified, both in terms of academic expertise and teaching qualifications.

The panel finds that the current admissions procedure needs an elaboration, as the criteria are not that clear-cut and students with a range of backgrounds are admissible. A particular issue that needs attention is managing the expectations of applicants/students concerning the level of legal research skills that they need to possess upon admission to the programme.

A general recommendation for all Advanced Studies LLM programme is to create synergies between them and exchange best practices to come to more structured thesis procedures for all programmes.

The panel finds that the programme deploys a good set of committees and initiatives to look after the quality and coherence of the programme. The programme is open to feedback and is willing to take measures to improve itself.

## Standard 3

The variety of assessment methods helps the diverse group of students show that they mastered the material. The level of the assessment reflects the content of the courses. Although in practice the independence of first and second assessor of the thesis seems to be well organised by ICR, this is not sufficiently transparent in the documentation. The panel recommends to properly and insightfully document the process as well as separating the assessment of the product (the thesis) from the process of the student.

The EC performs its legal duties but takes a rather reactive stance. Going forward, the panel expects a more pro-active stance of the EC and a clear awareness of the existing rules and regulations, which it considers pivotal in ensuring and upholding quality standards.

#### Standard 4

The final theses are of academic quality and fits within the expectations for an LLM degree in the Netherlands.

After graduation, students find international and relevant jobs at an advanced position.

Standard	Full time	Part time
1. Intended learning outcomes	Meets the standard	Meets the standard
2. Teaching-learning environment	Meets the standard	Meets the standard
3. Student assessment	Meets the standard	Meets the standard
4. Achieved learning outcomes	Meets the standard	Meets the standard
<b>Final conclusion</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Positive</b>

## 2. Introduction

### 2.1. Assessment framework

This advisory report contains findings, considerations and judgements about the Master Advanced Studies in International Children's Rights (ICR) of Leiden University. The Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO) bases its accreditation decision on this report.

The Master Advanced Studies in International Children's Rights is part of a cluster of ten advanced master's programmes at Leiden University that are assessed as a cluster by one panel. Nine programmes are offered by the Leiden Law School and one by the Faculty of Governance and Global Affairs.

### 2.2. Panel

The panel that performed the assessment of the master's programme in International Children's Rights consists of independent experts, including one student member. The NVAO has approved the composition of the panel on 20 October 2023:

- Prof. Ramses Wessel (chair), Vice-Dean of the Faculty of Law, University of Groningen, professor and Head of the Programme European and Economic Law;
- Prof. Erik Franckx, Professor, former Director of the Centre for International Law, Faculty of Law and Criminology, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium;
- Prof. Anna Konert, Dean of the Faculty of Law and Administration, Lazarski University in Warsaw, Poland;
- Dr. Stefan Lorenzmeier, Academic staff member in charge of the International Relations of the University of Augsburg's Faculty of Law, Germany;
- Prof. Kirsten Sandberg, Professor of Law, Department of Public and International Law, University of Oslo, Norway;
- Prof. Thomas Krebs, Associate professor in Commercial Law, University of Oxford, UK;
- Dr. Adam Chalmers, Senior Lecturer of European Union Politics, Politics and International Relations, University of Edinburgh, UK;

- Prof. Burkhard Schafer, Professor for Computational Legal Theory, University of Edinburgh, UK;
- Ms. Liv Bennink LL.B (student member), Master student in Law, Utrecht University.

The panel was supported by drs. Linda te Marvelde and dr. Meg van Bogaert, who acted as independent secretaries.

### 2.3. Approach

The university, programme, panel and secretary have agreed on a 'development-oriented' approach to the assessment. This makes use of the opportunity offered by the assessment framework to place less emphasis on accountability and more on improvement and development. This methodology is based on trust and responds to the autonomy and ownership of the study programme as emphasised in the framework. Transparency, openness, and co-creation are key in this approach. Characteristic of the development-oriented approach is that the panel makes a preliminary statement about the generic quality of the programme on the basis of existing documentation. The subsequent site visit is – in part – dedicated to discussing the programme's own themes that are of importance to its development. This step-by-step approach aims to reduce the pressure traditionally placed on site visits. The programme knows in advance where it stands and thus experiences the opportunity to openly submit development themes to the panel. This promotes an equal dialogue between peers.

### 2.4. Working Method

Approximately ten weeks before the site visit (December 2023), the panel received the documentation, including a self-assessment report and a selection of fifteen recent master's theses including their evaluation forms (see appendix 3). These documents formed the basis for the assessment of the generic quality achieved. The panel studied the documents and organised an online panel meeting two weeks prior to the site visit (23 February 2024). In this meeting, the panel discussed its initial findings and provisional

conclusions regarding the quality achieved on the four standards of the assessment framework. Part of the meeting was a (online) consultation opportunity for students and lecturers who wanted to engage in conversation with the panel. Part of the meeting was a (online) consultation opportunity for students and lecturers who wanted to engage in conversation with the panel. One student took advantage of the opportunity to speak with the panel online.

On 26 February 2024, (representatives of) the panel had an initial online meeting with the Faculty Boards of Leiden Law School and FGGA to discuss some of the panel's initial impressions and questions.

The site visit took place on 4-7 March 2024 in Leiden (see appendix 4). During the site visit, the panel spoke with delegations of students and teaching staff, examinations board, alumni, professional field and the management team of the programme. Part of the site visit was dedicated to development themes that the programmes themselves identified.

These discussions also provided the panel with the opportunity to raise (remaining) questions regarding

the generic quality of the programme with those involved. At the end of the visit, the panel drew up findings and recommendations. The panel's chair presented these orally to stakeholders of the programme.

After the visit, the secretaries drew up the advisory report. This report (presented here) contains the assessment of the programme's generic quality on the four standards of the framework. On the basis of this report, the NVAO makes an accreditation decision. After processing the panel's feedback, the secretary sent the advisory report to the programme for the purpose of fact-checking the text. The secretary has corrected factual inaccuracies identified by the programme in the final version. The executive board of Leiden University received the final report on 26 September 2024.

Due to overlap in programme structure and support in this cluster, some repetition in the assessment reports is inevitable. These overlapping parts have a different colour (blue) from the programme-specific parts.

## 3. Characteristics of the programme

### 3.1. Administrative data

Programme name	International Children's Rights
CROHO:	75121
Level and orientation:	Academic Advanced Master's Studies
Credits:	60
Specialisations or tracks	N.a.
Location:	Leiden
Mode of study	Full time, Part time
Language of instruction	English

### 3.2. Organisation

The Master Advanced Studies in International Children's Rights (ICR) is part of a cluster of nine Advanced Studies LLM programmes of Leiden Law School. The nine advanced LLM programmes have a joint management and support structure and are all non-government funded. In 2022 a total of 230 students enrolled in an Advanced Studies LLM programme at Leiden Law School.

Leiden Law School is governed by a Faculty Board, consisting of the Dean, research portfolio holder (vice-dean), the education portfolio holder (vice-dean), the director of operations and the student member (assessor). The education portfolio holder is primarily responsible for the development of faculty education policy and for the implementation and organisation of education.

The Academic Board of each individual programme consists of a Programme Director, an Academic coordinator and a Programme coordinator. This Board is responsible for the day-to-day running of the programme, the development of the programme, for student mentoring and advice and for the assessment of academic work.

The Programme Directors of the nine Advanced Studies LLM programmes form the *Quality Assurance Standing Committee* at Leiden Law School, discussing a range of issues pertaining to the quality of

education. This committee is supported by two staff members of the Office for International Education: a dedicated Quality Assurance Manager and the Head of the Office.

Leiden University is a public organisation, funded by the Dutch government. However, the Advanced Studies LLM programmes are non-funded. This means that no government funding is received and therefore the tuition fees cover the full programmes costs.

### 3.3. Recommendations previous assessment

The previous evaluation assessment panel (2018) did not have any specific recommendations with respect to the ICR programme.

The programme is continuously reviewed by its programme management together with its staff members. The most recent annual session with all staff members (August 2023) focused among others on the well-being of students within the international classroom and the services provided to students by the programme, faculty and university.

## 4. Strong points

The panel identified numerous strengths with the key strengths listed below.

1. The panel finds that ICR is a **unique and necessary programme**. It is one of the few programmes, worldwide, that offers postgraduate specialisation in the field of international children's rights. Moreover, its focus on law rather than on multidisciplinary aspects pertaining to international children's rights is unique.
2. The panel finds that the programme benefits significantly from its **integration within Leiden Law School's Department of Child Law**, leveraging expert faculty and rich academic resources that align closely with its learning objectives.
3. The programme especially stands out for its **staff members**, who are academic specialists with impressive professional experiences as well.
4. The ICR programme is an extremely strong programme due to its **highly varied, flexible and cutting-edge content**. It combines a broad outlook, in-depth knowledge and reflection on important areas.
5. ICR adeptly **integrates advanced academic knowledge with both academic and practical skills**, preparing students for a variety of career paths in international children's rights law. Its unique focus, coupled with its interdisciplinary approach and a diverse, international classroom environment, enhances students' understanding of children's rights from an international, global and regional perspective.
6. The **extracurricular activities** offered, such as conferences, guest lectures or visits to institutions like UNICEF/study trips to Geneva amongst others, and the **intensive support** for individual students, are enriching.

## 5. Recommendations

The panel makes several recommendations to aid with the further development of the programme. These do not detract from the positive assessment of the generic quality of the programme.

1. A general recommendation for all Advanced Studies LLM programmes is to formulate a clear definition of what the **'advanced label'** entails. Leiden Law School is recommended to make certain that it becomes a shared definition to make it a strong(er) label, to ensure consistent messaging towards all stakeholders, and to be able to manage the expectations of prospective students accordingly. This is important also to differentiate the level of the course (and the output by students) from regular LLM programmes.
2. The panel recommends that the programmes explore ways to **reduce the (experienced) workload and assessment load** for both students and staff. In line with this recommendation, the programmes could consider introducing more formative feedback and more time for students to reflect.
3. With regards to **thesis assessment**, the panel recommends that the second assessor always performs a comprehensive and independent assessment of the thesis and not merely conducts a marginal check of the first assessor's findings.
4. The panel recommends that the Advanced Studies LLM programmes increase transparency of the **thesis process**. Part of this process is an agreement between all programmes on thesis supervision guidelines; Furthermore, the panel recommends that the thesis process (and any personal learning gain) is assessed separately from the final level attained.
5. There are no clear criteria set based on which the admission committee chooses successful candidates. The **admission procedure needs an elaboration**, for instance on rules applied to the situation when there is a competition between applicants. A particular issue that needs attention is managing the expectations of applicants/students concerning the level of legal research skills that they need to possess upon admission to the programme.
6. Given the **fast-evolving nature of international children's rights**, the programme must ensure its curriculum remains at the forefront of new legal developments, challenges, and practices.

## 6. Assessment

## Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

*The intended learning outcomes tie in with the level and orientation of the programme; they are geared to the expectations of the professional field, the discipline, and international requirements.*

### Findings and considerations

#### Programme aims and ambitions

The Master Advanced Studies in International Children's Rights (ICR) is a small-scale and advanced specialised, postgraduate programme in the field of international children's rights law. It is designed for law graduates, who wish to pursue a career as a legal professional in (inter)nationally operating law firms, (inter)national courts and tribunals, international institutions, (inter)national governmental bodies (incl. e.g. foreign/diplomatic service), (inter)national non-governmental organisations, national human rights institutions, including independent children's rights institutions, and the private sector. The programme has also been developed to welcome those who wish to pursue further academic research (PhD or otherwise). It is furthermore designed to accommodate students with a non-legal background, but with considerable working experience in the field of (or fields relevant for) international children's rights.

The complex, multi-layered and legal interdisciplinary nature of international children's rights requires specialist knowledge to effectively assess its meaning and implications for the position of children at the domestic level. Hence, it is the programme's ambition to equip the students with the knowledge and the skills necessary to work or conduct research in the field of international children's rights, in a dynamic and ever-changing world, and to lay the basis for life-long learning in this field. The programme endeavours to make students experts on the characteristics and functioning of different children's rights protection mechanisms in their specific political, social and legal settings and on the various ways in which they may coexist, overlap and influence each other. In addition, it aims to enable students to reflect

critically on the challenges of the implementation of children's rights at the domestic level, also considering the challenges of the 21st Century.

The programme has its focus on children's human rights and the curriculum is structured around core areas of international, regional and domestic law pertaining to children. The end goal is for students to have a deep understanding of both procedural and substantive aspects pertaining to children's rights and develop well founded and independent views on current and future challenges of this emerging field of law. The knowledge and skills acquired upon completion of this programme is also valuable for experts in other (related) areas of law, such as general human rights, rights of specific groups (women, migrants or people with disabilities) and domestic areas of law that affect children and their families.

ICR is one of the few programmes, worldwide, that offers postgraduate specialisation in the field of international children's rights. Moreover, its focus on law rather than on multidisciplinary aspects of international children's rights is unique. The programme is closely tied in with the themes of the research programme of the Leiden Law School, in particular the programmes 'Effective Protection of Fundamental Rights in a Pluralist World', and 'Criminal Justice: legitimacy, accountability and effectivity'.

The panel concludes that the programme effectively integrates advanced academic knowledge with academic and practical skills, catering to a diverse range of career paths in international children's rights law. Its unique focus on law, coupled with interdisciplinary approaches, prepares students for complex real-world challenges. The international and culturally diverse classroom environment enriches the learning experience, fostering a comprehensive understanding of children's rights from various (global) perspectives. This is further enhanced by the programme's strong connection to current research and practice in the field.

### Intended learning outcomes

For all law degree programmes in the Netherlands, a Subject Specific Reference Framework has been drawn up, which was most recently updated in 2020. The programme objectives of ICR have been set in line with the orientation described in the framework, both in context of the subject matter and the methodology, as well as in drawing upon the diverse cultural and legal resources available within the student body.

The aims and ambitions are translated into eight Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs), see Appendix 1. These ILOs are elaborated in detail and related to the internationally recognised Dublin descriptors at master's level, for example by deepened and specialised knowledge in the specific disciplines. The ILOs are identical for the full time and the part time mode of the programme and have remained stable since the previous evaluation in 2018. The ILOs have been set based on the academic and professional judgement of the programme staff, the professional field and the programme Advisory Board. According to the panel, programme goals and the ILOs are appropriate and fitting for an academic master's programme in the field of International Children's Rights.

To keep up with the fast and continuous development of the field of international children's rights, the programme is continuously reviewed by its programme management together with its staff members. Regular staff meetings, annual reflection meetings, course evaluations, meetings with the Board of Advisors (consisting of representatives from academia, UNICEF, private organisations, and government), the research and professional activities of the staff as well as an annual feedback and evaluation session with students from the programme allow ICR to reflect critically on its performances, considering the programme's core objectives and intended learning outcomes. The panel appreciates that the programme continuously works to keep the programme up-to-date.

### Advanced nature

The self-evaluation reports of the ten Advanced Studies programmes under review address the differences between the Advanced Studies LLM programmes and regular LLM programmes. Most

notably, the advanced master's programmes are geared towards achieving a higher level than regular master's programmes. This is evidenced by the terminology that is used; an advanced level asks for profound and critical levels of research, insight and analysis. Advanced master's courses are mostly offered at level 600, whereas regular master's programmes offer level 500 courses. In terms of methodology and focus, the advanced programmes should be substantially more in-depth and demanding. In addition, students in advanced level programmes have to process more (complex) materials in the same amount of time as regular master students. The advanced level is also reflected in the expectation of a high academic level in the advanced master thesis which is expected to be more extensive or generally based on more complex materials than a thesis produced in a regular master's programme. Ideally, students in the advanced programmes have relevant working experience, which should enrich the students' learning experiences and enhance the learning community of students and staff.

The panel discussed extensively what the label 'Advanced Studies' of the LLMs entails exactly with various stakeholders of the programmes, including the students. Throughout the site visit a range of different interpretations of an advanced programme were given. The panel was informed by some interviewees that it starts with the selection process that targets prospective students who are motivated, have relevant work experience and/or already successfully graduated from a master's programme. Others highlighted the curricula themselves in which students encounter a higher course level, a higher workload, (possible) higher learning gain and overall greater intensity than in a regular master's programme. The diverse and international peer groups were also mentioned as a key characteristic of an advanced programme. Overall, based on the variety of interpretations, the panel concludes that there is not yet a shared definition of the advanced nature of the programmes. The panel therefore recommends Leiden Law School, in close collaboration with the MIRD programme - to clearly define an Advanced Studies LLM, in order to make it a strong(er) label, to ensure consistent messaging towards all stakeholders, to ensure consistent messaging towards all stakeholders, to better clarify

the distinction between the advanced and regular LLM courses, and to be able to manage the expectations of prospective students accordingly (see Standard 2).

## Conclusion

### *Meets the standard*

The panel concludes that the general direction and ambition of the programme correspond to labour market needs and equips graduates to pursue a further career in academia, should they wish to do so. Furthermore, the panel finds that there is a very clear tie-in between the ILOs and the programme level and orientation.

Also, the panel appreciates that the programme makes conscientious and active efforts to stay ahead of the curve and keep the programme up to date, which is of critical importance given the fast-evolving nature of international children's rights.

A general recommendation for all Advanced Studies LLM programmes is to formulate a clear definition of what the 'advanced' label at Leiden Law School entails. Leiden Law School is recommended to make certain that it becomes a shared definition to make it a strong(er) label, to ensure consistent messaging towards all stakeholders, to clearly distinguish the level of the courses and the output of students in relation to the regular LLM programmes, and to be able to manage the expectations of prospective students accordingly.

## Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

*The curriculum, the teaching-learning environment and the quality of the teaching staff enable the incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.*

### Findings and considerations

#### Student Intake

All Advanced Studies LLM programmes aim to attract students from a wide range of countries and educational backgrounds. In the past few years, Leiden Law School has welcomed students from more than twenty countries across Europe, North and South America, and Asia in, reflecting a great variety in nationalities and legal cultures.

Recruitment, selection, student and programme support are arranged through the Office for International Education, in close consultation with each of the programmes. A procedure for admissions and quality assurance is supported by the management team of each programme.

The panel has discussed the admissions/selection procedure extensively during the site visit, mainly to understand how the admissions procedure relates to the advanced nature of the programmes and their status as so-called 'post-initial master's programmes'. The panel learned that the Leiden Law School admissions process is relatively similar for all programmes in terms of application procedures, minimum requirements (academic and English language). In principle all programmes require students to have a law degree that already grants them access to the profession in their particular jurisdiction. However, this requirement can be mitigated by having an equivalent of any other master's degree combined with sufficient background in law, for instance obtained by professional experience. Each programme selects its own students, taking the aforementioned criteria into consideration.

Based on the current admissions criteria and the discussions with the programme, the panel finds that the current admissions procedure gives the programmes options to admit students with a great variety of educational backgrounds, based on an

estimation of the student's future study success, but without necessarily taking the desired intended advanced level and orientation into consideration. In practice, this means that some admitted students are confronted with a learning curve that could be too steep, for instance for those who have had no or limited experience with academic research in their initial degree programme, which is not uncommon for students with a non-European initial degree. In addition, the panel finds that the admission procedure would benefit from an elaboration on rules applied to situations when there is a competition between applicants. The panel therefore suggests that the programmes reconsider the admission's procedure, taking into consideration the issues above.

ICR welcomes around 25 students from all around the world. On average the programme's international classroom consists of students from four or five different continents, with a wide variety of nationalities and cultural backgrounds. The programme staff continue to promote the Advanced Masters within the international children's rights networks and beyond, in order to preserve a steady growth in the student numbers.

The panel appreciates that the programme has developed a special children's rights scholarship scheme. This scheme includes special scholarships for students from various African countries or from developing countries more generally. There are also a number of smaller scholarships available to students in children's rights from both the global North and South. The panel finds it a strength that the programme continuously seeks special scholarships, for instance through the network of the UNICEF Chair in Children's Rights and the Leiden University Fund, thus providing opportunities for students who would otherwise not have access to this programme.

In line with discussions on the advanced nature of the programmes and the admissions procedure, 'management of expectations' was a recurring theme during the site visit. The panel noticed in discussions

with the programmes and with students, that there is no shared definition of what an 'advanced programme' is (see Standard 1). Some students, therefore, expressed their disappointment in the programmes ranging from issues on group sizes (large versus small), the definition of 'international' (eurocentrism versus globalism), student support (amount of individual guidance/feedback) etc. In line with its findings in Standard 1 on the advanced nature of the Advanced Studies LLM programmes, the panel recommends that the programmes guarantee clear communications with potential students to ensure that they know what to expect from the programmes.

### Embedding in Leiden Law School

The panel finds that the programme benefits significantly from its integration within Leiden Law School's Department of Child Law, leveraging expert faculty and rich academic resources that align closely with its learning objectives. The Department of Child Law possesses specialist expertise in the area of children's rights and child law. In addition to the Master Advanced Studies in International Children's Rights, the department of Child Law runs the only Dutch Child Law master's programme in the Netherlands, the annual International Summer School Programme 'Frontiers of Children's Rights' and the bi-annual Children's Rights Moot Court. The Department also hosts the Leiden Children's Rights Observatory, an open-source data base that includes case commentaries written by international experts on children's rights, which offer original analyses of and critical reflections on the views of the CRC Committee in the context of legal developments and emerging (global) trends related to children's rights. The department has strong international and national networks at its disposal and is involved in a wide range of research projects at the heart of children's rights.

Furthermore, Leiden Law School has the advantage of its proximity to and links with relevant institutions, including the Permanent Bureau of The Hague Conference on Private International Law, the International Criminal Court and UNICEF. The City of Leiden hosts a number of international civil society organisations, based in the Children's Rights Home, including Defence for Children International, ECPAT and ICDI. Other relevant international civil society

organisations can be found in the Netherlands as well, including War Child, Save the Children and Kids Rights, all of which, according to the panel, enrich the teaching-learning environment of ICR students.

### Curriculum

The programme is offered full-time (one academic year) and part-time (two academic years), both with daytime classes. Students who study part-time are offered the same facilities and courses as the full-time students.

Part-time ICR students are very limited in number. For these students, a tailor-made programme is designed allowing them to follow a coherent programme which builds up towards the writing of the thesis. The panel thinks that this is a good approach, considering the small number of part-time students and the personal guidance.

The ICR programme spans one full academic year, from September until the end of August. The programme comprises two core courses (20 EC), six courses (30 EC total), and a final thesis (10 EC). In the first semester, the programme offers one overarching core course on the interaction between children's rights and other legal systems. This course serves as a means to deal with the diversity of intake as it is dedicated to providing an in-depth analysis of the foundations of children's rights', which the panel think is a necessary foundation for studying the interaction in the second part of the programme.

The panel appreciates that the programme combines comprehensive knowledge of and reflection on the legal aspects of the Convention on the Rights of a Child (CRC) with an understanding of the challenges in its implementation around the world and in various fields. The legal focus, high academic level and the combination of global, regional and national outlooks are specifically highlighted by the panel. The programme covers a wide variety of subjects, which is well appreciated by students. The level of depth met the expectations of students as well. Through the variety of subjects, students are able to engage in different and new areas of children's rights law. Students also mention that they felt enabled to engage in challenging areas

of children's rights, and within academic debates, showing a proper academic character.

From a cautious standpoint, the panel remarks that it seems that the programme's intensive nature and the constraint of a 60 EC limit might restrict the scope of subjects covered. Expanding elective options or integrating more flexible learning pathways could potentially address emerging fields within children's rights. And, while recognizing the practical challenges, enhancing the integration of internships into the curriculum could further bridge the gap between academic learning and professional practice, even if not as a mandatory component.

### Thesis

There is a common thesis protocol in place for students of all Advanced Studies LLM programmes, which includes common grading procedures and second reader forms. Thesis workshops are part of the programmes in order to prepare all students for writing a thesis, including those who have not written a thesis before. However, the panel has found disparities between thesis (supervision) trajectories and it therefore recommends that the Advanced Studies programmes take more advantage of the synergies between them and exchange best practices to come to more structured procedures for all programmes.

The panel notes that ICR prepares students for in-depth research in an understudied or specialized issue. Students are guided throughout the thesis with a trajectory, focusing on research skills and programme-specific topics. According to students, the thesis trajectory and research that can be conducted into specialized and complicated areas provide a unique opportunity compared to other masters. The pathway to the thesis is integrated into the whole learning process over the year; the panel considers this a best practice.

### Approach to teaching and learning

Teaching is based on the Socratic method (i.e. high-level course discussions between the professor and the students, rather than traditional lectures, and peer learning amongst students), as well as both a practical and theoretical approach to the subject area. Structured self-study is an integral and essential part of all courses, in order to enable

informed discussions in class. Class attendance is mandatory. The programme is demanding and students experience a high workload. ICR students report that the workload, especially readings/study material, is intense. The current set-up of the programme (block structure) in combination with the number of materials that need to be studied makes that students can experience overburdening. The panel therefore encourages the programme to consider how to find a balance between intensity and time for reflection.

The panel finds that the international and culturally diverse classroom environment enriches the learning experience, fostering a comprehensive understanding of children's rights from various global perspectives. This is further enhanced by the programme's strong connection to current research and practice in the field. As a suggestion, the panel finds that the diverse international student body is a resource that could be utilized even further. The programme, in line with many programmes of this type, remains focused on Europe and other parts of the Western world). Even European/Western students may encounter in their professional lives children who were brought up under radically different legal regimes, and the relevant intercultural competency is needed for both domestic and international jobs and deployments. The panel finds that it can be helpful (also for European/Western students) to create spaces where students can learn from the experience in countries outside the "big blocks". This requires space where students from non-European/Western countries are invited to take the lead/focus on a topic, rather than simply contributing to a general debate.

Positive feedback by students was given about the didactical tools used in seminars and lectures. Different techniques such as audio-visual and interactive tools contribute to the learning environment. In addition, the panel finds that ICR offers students many extracurricular opportunities as they are actively encouraged to take part in activities, such as monthly meetings on special themes not covered by the programme, expert meetings, symposia or conferences, within or outside of Leiden Law School, the biannual Children's Rights Moot Court, field trips (e.g. to UNICEF, the Leiden Children's Rights Home and the Permanent

Bureau of The Hague Conference on Private International Law) and internships. In relation to the course 'Enforcement and monitoring of children's rights', students visit Geneva for one week and attend the 'May session' of the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, among others.

### Student support

The panel finds that the programme strives for an ambitious study culture in which involvement and commitment of students and lecturers are the norm. This implies inspiring and challenging education, active student participation and a solid structure and organisation of the curriculum. To promote study success, measures are taken to enhance student motivation and the quality of learning, for example via annual curriculum revisions, an introduction week, career workshops, optimising timetabling and professionalising student counselling.

Staff are available to students to respond to questions and problems. Furthermore, social activities are organised which are deemed crucial for a positive social and learning environment. The programme also pays attention to news items, job and internship opportunities, via social media pages.

The Advanced Studies LLM programmes at Leiden Law School have a dedicated support structure, arranged through the Office for International Education. This office offers career-oriented workshops, spread throughout the academic year. Furthermore, a Brightspace page is set up for students to find information, useful links on jobs, housing, Dutch language courses etc.

Student progress is monitored by the course lecturers who discuss concerns on student progress and performance with the Programme Coordinator and Academic Coordinator. Often, potential problems are identified early in the course and additional support may be offered if a student is struggling with specific course components.

Student welfare is important, in particular international students. The programme coordinator is the first point of contact for students and Leiden Law School has a Well-Being Officer as well as a dedicated careers advisor. Leiden Law School recently opened a Student Living Room, intended as

a space for relaxation and connection. Peer support students are present every day and are committed to the well-being of their fellow students. The panel values the efforts by the programme to undertake social activities and create a community. This is particularly important for the many international students with a limited network when arriving in Leiden.

The panel finds that the small-scale nature of ICR enables the programme to keep a close eye on the learning needs and interests of the individual students, also within the dynamic of the international classroom. The programme organizes (informal) meetings between students and staff (incl. welcome lunch, monthly meetings and Christmas lunch/dinner), between students of the international children's rights and Dutch child law master's, and between students and programme director (individual meetings, 2 times a year). The programme coordinator and academic coordinator have regular contact with students and are always available by e-mail. Staff members play a pivotal role in providing a stimulating and safe learning environment and they make time to meet with students outside of the regular contact hours. Students can also engage with or participate in the research or teaching activities of the department.

The Programme Director of the programme on international children's rights meets with each student individually, in the first semester. This meeting aims to assess the well-being of the students and their experience of the start of the programme. It also contributes to students' feelings of safety and comfort and enhances their understanding that the programme's staff, including the programme management, is there to support them throughout the programme. This first meeting with the Programme Director will be followed by a second one in March, which has a more forward-looking character (i.e. to discuss students' progress as well as their future plans). The panel appreciates the programme's efforts but does draw attention to the question on how ICR will manage to keep up being this staff intensive? Especially since ICR wants a steady growth in student numbers, the programme might have to explore the sustainability and scalability of current student support practices.

## Language of instruction

The English-taught non-government funded Advanced Studies LLM programmes were originally designed with the idea of attracting high level international students to the Netherlands. Leiden Law School chose to offer these programmes in English to internationalise the departments and the teaching and research of certain fields which are of transboundary and international relevance. Having students from other cultures and other legal backgrounds was seen as an asset to the university. It also allowed for highly specialized programmes and expertise in a particular field to be recognized. In order to do this the language of English was the choice taken to allow for, as much as possible, a diverse group of people to participate.

English opens up possibilities for the materials used in studying and learning. Skills such as critical reading and reflection, research expertise and writing are honed in a different way in another language. The possibilities to bring in lecturers and people from the professional field from other nationalities to provide their experiences to students are seen as a major benefit in allowing for open and diverse discussion and debate. Reinforcing the idea of building, connecting, sharing ideas and communicating with the world is important for all professions. Studying in English provides tools that will not lose value but only add value to the student and the lecturing staff. Communicating in English adds value to graduates in their careers and opens up more doors and possibilities for a career path than in one's home country alone. This is particularly so for Advanced Studies LLM programmes and the MSc in International Relations and Diplomacy as these are specialized programmes which seek to offer expertise in a particular field of international relevance. Considering the goals of the advanced master's studies programmes, the panel concludes that the choice for English as the language of instruction is logical and of added value.

## Staff

Teaching staff of ICR consists mainly of Leiden University Staff and is complemented with guest lecturers from the practice of International Children's Rights.

Leiden University has heavily invested in the University Teaching Qualification (UTQ), attributing structural attention to the teacher professionalisation process. All lecturers at Leiden University are required to obtain a UTQ.

Leiden University adheres to The Guidelines on Language Policy which set out agreements on the level of language competence of lecturers, staff and students, the language of instruction, the dual language of communications and the language used within the University administration. A Language Policy for University Lecturers is in place for those who teach in English. The required level of English proficiency is C1. Most faculty members publish mainly in English and frequently present and lecture abroad.

Guest lecturers are specialised and often international professionals on a specific area of law. By using guest lecturers ICR has the advantage of incorporating real and current legal experience and discussions in courses, which enhances the learning environment for students. Furthermore, students visit law firms, international legal organisations and businesses at the invitation of the guest lecturers, allowing them to build their legal network. Guest lecturers are always partnered with a course coordinator who is a member of the academic staff, to ensure the quality and level of teaching.

The overall quality of the teaching staff is excellent, according to the panel. The teaching staff is well qualified to lecture on the topics covered in the curriculum (both in research/publication and theoretical knowledge and also offering insights from cases). They are leading scholars in the field of international children's rights, have extensive professional experience, and hold key positions in the field. For example, the programme director is currently the chair of the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child. Students report that the teaching staff is approachable as well and open to feedback.

## Quality

In addition to each course being evaluated, students are invited to express their views about the courses to the lecturer, programme coordinator and/or academic coordinator. Annual course evaluations are

also used to make improvements Common issues raised in the evaluations are discussed in the Quality Assurance Standing Committee (QAS), in which all Advanced Studies LLM programmes participate.

The content and structure of the programme as well as the different assessment methods are chosen and evaluated by the programme's management and the staff members on a regular basis, among others via the annual feedback session with students and regular staff meetings. In addition, the small-scale nature of the ICR programme allows for continuous reflection during the academic year and enables the programme to keep an eye on the learning needs and interests of the individual students, also within the dynamic of the classroom.

Furthermore, the panel finds that regular staff meetings, annual reflection meetings and team days, course evaluations, meetings with the Board of Advisors (consisting of representatives from academia, UNICEF, private organisations, and government) as well as an annual feedback and evaluation sessions with students, allow the programme to reflect critically on its performances, considering the programme's core objectives and intended learning outcomes.

## Conclusion

*Meets the standard*

The curriculum of the Advanced Studies LLM programme ICR reflects the ILOs of the programme. The panel finds that ICR adeptly integrates advanced academic knowledge with practical skills, preparing

students for a variety of career paths in international children's rights law. Its unique focus, coupled with an interdisciplinary approach and a diverse, international classroom environment, enhances students' understanding of children's rights from an international, global and regional perspective and prepares them for complex real-world challenges.

The programme is feasible, but students report that the workload, especially with regards to reading materials, is (too) high. The panel recommends that the programme explores ways to reduce the (experienced) workload.

The panel finds that the current admissions procedure needs an elaboration, as the criteria are not that clear-cut and students with a range of backgrounds are admissible. A particular issue that needs attention is managing the expectations of applicants/students concerning the level of legal research skills that they need to possess upon admission to the programme.

A general recommendation for all Advanced Studies LLM programmes is to create synergies between them and exchange best practices to come to more structured thesis procedures for all programmes.

The teaching staff is well-qualified, both in terms of academic expertise and teaching qualifications.

The panel finds that the programme deploys a good set of committees and initiatives to look after the quality and coherence of the programme. The programme is open to feedback and is willing to take measures to improve itself.

## Standard 3: Student assessment

*The programme has an adequate system of student assessment in place.*

### Findings and considerations

#### Assessment Policy

The Advanced Studies LLM programmes refer to the Rules and Guidelines of the Exam Commission and the Course and Exam Regulations (in Dutch: OER) for policies and rules concerning assessments. The programmes have adopted a format for assessment and for awarding grades, consisting of criteria for assessment of exams, papers and presentations and forms that need to be completed for each piece of assessed work. To ensure continuity and alignment at both programme and course level, matrices are used as a safeguard and quality assurance tool. The panel concludes that the programmes have a sound governance framework regarding assessments.

#### Course assessment

The panel is impressed with the variety of assessment methods that test a broad range of knowledge and skills, and are challenging and innovative. Students are pleased with both the volume of assessments, as well as the methods of assessment.

Given the short duration of many courses, there appears to be a challenge in employing a variety of assessment methods within each course. The panel suggests, from a cautious standpoint, that exploring additional, perhaps more innovative assessment formats could enhance the comprehensiveness of student evaluations. With various teams of lecturers involved in the programme, there could be differences in assessment approaches. From a perspective of continuous improvement, fostering more uniform assessment standards and sharing best practices among faculty could further enhance fairness and reliability.

In addition, the panel mentions that there are already a number of ways in which use of technology is incorporated in the assessments (e.g. use of footnoting software) which is a good thing. The panel

wonders if there is room for extending this even further as this could increase experience with common technological tools – from the mundane (how to make a completing powerpoint) to the more advanced (working with Lexis AI systems, or tools like Neota Logic).

At the start of the academic year, an overview of course contents, including assessment methods, weighting and scheduling is shared with the students. This provides insight into the diversity of assessment methods.

In principle, lecturers are free to decide which assessment methods they want to use but must inform students in advance via the course descriptions, which include a cross-reference to the ILOs. At the start of each course, assessments and grading are always discussed with the students as well. Lecturers provide written feedback on assessment forms to evidence why a grade was awarded, and review sessions are organised to provide further feedback and/or discuss grading.

A point of concern for the panel is possible 'over-assessment'. It seems that students are continually faced with deadlines, adding to the intensity and high workload that students report (see Standard 2). This leaves limited time for reflection. In addition, it seems that assessments are mostly summative and hardly formative. The panel suggests that the programmes explore whether it would be possible to lower the assessment load for both students and staff.

#### Thesis assessment

Thesis grading is based on a common procedure for all of the Advanced Studies LLM programmes. Each thesis is assessed by two examiners. The first examiner is the thesis supervisor; the second examiner is – often, but not always - the Programme Director or the Academic Coordinator to ensure consistency in the grading. In some instances, students will have two supervisors (depending on the topic), in which case they will also grade the thesis.

During the site visit, the panel discussed at length the role and task of the second assessor with the various programmes. The programmes use a similar, but often slightly different working method. This is not a problem, according to the panel, as long as there are some basic agreements. These include that the second assessor always performs a comprehensive and independent assessment of the thesis and not merely a marginal check of the first assessor's findings.

Another topic that the panel discussed during the various interviews was if and to what extent the amount of guidance given during the thesis process should influence the final grade. As there are currently no set guidelines on the number of meetings between student and supervisor, there is quite some variety in the amount of feedback given to individual students. The panel argues that the amount of guidance and feedback given should be reflected in the assessment. In addition, supervisors should be alert to students who do not ask for any guidance at all, as this could be indicative of plagiarism or improper use of AI.

A closely related topic that was discussed at length during the various interviews was to what extent programmes should include 'learning gain' in the assessment of theses. The panel argues that student development is indeed important, especially given differences in prior education and backgrounds. However, the panel stresses that the assessment of a student's progress and development should be assessed separately from the quality of the thesis and final level attained. This would improve the transparency and fairness of the thesis assessment process.

The panel's overall impression from the interviews during the site visit is that the programmes generally deal well with the independent and comprehensive assessment by the second assessor, the degree of thesis guidance given and issues concerning possible cases of plagiarism or use of AI. However, this was not sufficiently transparent in the documentation the panel had access to. The panel therefore recommends that the Advanced Studies LLM programmes increase transparency of the thesis process. Part of this process would be an agreement

of all programmes on thesis supervision guidelines; these should include, for example, an elaboration on the thesis supervision process and (the number of) meetings between students and their supervisors and the manner in which this affects the assessment. Furthermore, the manner in which personal learning gain plays a role in thesis assessment should be explicitly addressed. The panel recommends that the thesis process (and any personal learning gain) is assessed separately from the final level attained.

### Quality assurance

The nine Advanced Studies LLM master's programmes have their own dedicated Exam Commission (EC). The EC consists of academic staff members of Leiden Law School and an external member. The EC collectively sets up rules and policy, meets regularly and is supported by a secretary.

At the start of the academic year, the EC is provided with the overview of course contents, including forms of assessment, and weighting thereof. The EC also requests sample course matrices in order to verify and provide feedback where necessary. It also cross-checks the course objectives with the ILOs of the programme to ensure that they are in line.

The EC has a policy to determine how many exams and theses are selected for auditing purposes. The number of exams and theses depends on the size of the programme, the point of departure being that a sample of approximately 10% of the work will be a sufficient basis for a reliable auditing exercise. Should the auditing exercise raise questions, additional work will be selected. Theses (one outstanding, one good and one with passing grade) are subject to an audit by a legal expert from the EC who was not involved in the thesis supervision, as part of the quality assurance system. So far, the findings of the audit have been in line with the assessment and notably the grades given.

In conversation with the EC, the panel found that the EC takes a reactive stance in its approach. The panel refers to i.e. appointing examiners, setting up rules concerning the use of generative AI tools, and the manner in which thesis assessment forms are used by examiners. Going forward, the panel expects a more pro-active stance of the EC regarding the

existing rules and regulations, which it considers pivotal in ensuring and upholding quality standards.

In addition, the panel stresses the importance of regular calibration between assessors, within and between programmes. As discussed in Standard 2, there is potential to unlock synergies between the programmes with regards to the theses. The programmes do speak to each other via the QAS, but this has not yet led to a shared approach, for instance on the grading of theses.

## Conclusion

*Meets the standard*

The variety of assessment methods helps the diverse group of students show that they mastered the

material. The level of the assessment reflects the content of the courses. Although in practice the independence of first and second assessor of the thesis seems to be well organised by ICR, the panel recommends to also clarify this in the rules, for instance by separating assessment of the process and the product (the thesis).

The EC performs its legal duties but takes a rather reactive stance. Going forward, the panel expects a more pro-active stance of the EC, and sufficient knowledge of the existing rules and regulations by all members including the Chair, which it considers pivotal in ensuring and upholding quality standards.

## Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

*The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.*

### Findings and considerations

#### Final level

Students must undertake analytical legal research which builds on the knowledge gained throughout the programme. Research is conducted largely independently but with some supervision. According to the programme, the advanced level is not only reflected in the quality of the thesis, but also the fact that the thesis is written in quite a short period of time and must be an original contribution to the legal science. It should deal with a topic that was not already exhaustively discussed in one or more publications.

#### Thesis

Based on a sample of 15 theses, the panel was able to form a picture of the graduation level of ICR. The panel concluded that all the final theses it reviewed did meet the ILOs and are of sufficient academic quality at a master's level. The panel finds that the theses overall show a high quality of research. On balance, the quality of theses is high in terms of the standard of writing, structure, and general mechanics. The panel appreciates the topics that are addressed, for instance looking at the possibilities of the CRC interacting with other instruments and comparing different jurisdictions and relating them to the CRC.

The panel made a few remarks for the programme's consideration, which touched on the methodological rigour of some theses. In some cases, for example, the panel had expected more justification for research design choices. In a few instances the panel remarked on the lack of analytical depth and sometimes clarity regarding the interpretation of the international law that students base their research on. The panel suggests that, across the board, the development of the students' analytical skills is worthy of extra attention. However, all in all, the panel has no doubt that in all cases an academic master's level was achieved.

#### After graduation

Many students already have some or considerable working experience when starting the programme. The successful completion of the programme allows them to return to their previous line of work in a more senior post, or offers an opportunity for their careers to take a different direction.

Graduates of ICR enter or continue their careers in a wide variety of fields ranging from internships or jobs in (international) civil society organisations (in- or outside their country of origin), the Permanent Bureau of The Hague Conference on Private International Law, academic institutions, including Leiden Law School, and domestic legal practice. A majority of the graduates have found a position that is (directly) related to the field of international children's rights. ICR informed the panel that the feedback they receive from employers on the graduates is very positive.

The transition to the professional field is not always easy or quick. Some graduates need time to find a relevant post or have to take an internship. These positions are sometimes unpaid, requiring another investment from the students, which is not always an option. It might also not be easy to access the Dutch labour market, for instance, because of language barriers. In reality, non-EU students may have less opportunities than EU students. The panel has noted that the programme offers appropriate preparation for a professional career in the field of International Children's Rights. However, students might benefit from explicit and timely expectation management regarding job prospects on the Dutch labour market in the field of International Children's Rights.

Building on prior qualifications and experience, some students continue performing independent research, e.g. in the framework of subsequent PhD studies. Professional positions achieved after graduations, publications and a number of students continuing with a PhD programme, testify to the achieved level of the programme.

The Advanced Studies LLM programmes keep in contact with alumni, which allows them to record what the alumni are doing after graduation. Alumni also support the programme with guest lectures, updates on job possibilities and opportunities for internships, and serve as a point of contact for future students. ICR stays in contact with the alumni through a dedicated LinkedIn-group for alumni (enrolled students can join this group as of the second semester) and direct email correspondence (newsletters, activities, job opportunities, internships etc.). Feedback by graduates indicates that they feel well prepared for the competition for interesting

positions in Europe and elsewhere, both academically and professionally.

## Conclusion

*Meets the standard*

The final theses are of academic quality and fits within the expectations for an LLM degree in the Netherlands.

After graduation, students find international and relevant jobs at an advanced position.

## 7. Appendices

## Appendix 1: Intended Learning Outcomes

1	<i>Basic and overarching knowledge:</i>
	The graduate has a profound knowledge of, and critical insight into, the foundations of general International Children's Rights including its sources, principles, and institutions and interrelation with specialised fields.
2	<i>Specialist knowledge:</i>
	The graduate has profound knowledge of, and critical insight into, specific specialised fields of International Children's Rights and, in particular the respective fields of specialisation, including the overlaps. Differences and interaction between these specialised fields. The graduate has a critical and profound understanding of the policy considerations underlying these bodies of law and their context (i.e., as appropriate, their comparative or international context).
3	<i>Research abilities:</i>
	The graduate is capable of researching legal questions in general International Children's Rights, its specialised fields, by formulating coherent and concise problem statements, collecting and analysing data, judging their validity and relevance as well as by in-depth analysis and interpretation of legal sources, literature, and complex cases. The graduate is capable of posing critical questions, formulating an independent opinion on legal questions, and drawing well-founded conclusions. The graduate is able to provide innovative solutions to challenges in the field of International Children's Rights and, as appropriate, specialised fields, and to make recommendations for further research.
4	<i>Presentation of knowledge:</i>
	The graduate is capable of presenting his/her findings in a clear, readily understandable, methodical and logical manner, both orally and in writing, to both legal experts and non-lawyers alike. Students will further improve their existing writing, reading and research skills as well as their oral presentation skills. The language in all aspects of the programme is English. Therefore, English as a business and working language, using the specific vocabulary of International Children's Rights, and its specialised fields is extensively developed.
5	<i>Application of knowledge:</i>
	The graduate is capable of applying the acquired knowledge, research and practical skills in professions or functions that require application of International Children's Rights at an advanced postgraduate level. More specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The graduate possesses the legal knowledge, insight and skills to deeply engage with "the state of the art" in International Children's Rights, enabling them to pursue a career at an advanced level as a legal professional within international legal practice in law firms, the judiciary or policy advisory bodies on issues related to human rights or children, within national and international courts and tribunals, international institutions, (inter)national governmental bodies, national human rights institutes (e.g. ombudspersons), national, regional and international non-governmental organisations dealing with children's rights; companies or the foreign/diplomatic service and within law firms specialising in human rights in general and children's rights specifically, but also in related areas such as corporate social responsibility.</li> <li>b. b. The graduate possesses legal knowledge, insight and skills qualifying them to pursue an academic career by conducting further academic research, for example in a PhD programme.</li> </ul>
6	<i>Working environment:</i>
	The graduate has developed a professional work ethic enabling them to work in an international and intercultural environment. The graduate is capable of working both independently and in a team, again notably within an international environment.
7	<i>ICT skills:</i>
	The graduate is able to use new, or to enhance existing, ICT skills in research and communication.
8	<i>Keeping up knowledge:</i>
	The graduate has developed skills for lifelong learning, ensuring that they are able to identify and independently cover their own gaps in their knowledge.

## Appendix 2: Schematic overview of the curriculum

<i>Timing</i>	<i>Courses</i>	<i>ECTS</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Contact Hours</i>	<i>Focal Final Qualifications per Course</i>
Sep-Nov	Interaction between children's rights and other international legal systems (core course)	10	600	46	1, 3, 4 and 8
Sep-Nov	Children in the justice system	5	600	32	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8
Nov-Jan	Child and family in private international law	5	600	34	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8
Nov-Jan	Economic, social and cultural rights of Children	5	600	30	2, 3, 4 and 5
Feb-Mar	Child protection and children's rights	5	600	28	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8
Feb-Mar	Migration and children's rights	5	600	24	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8
Mar-May	Enforcement and monitoring of children's rights (core course)	10	600	48	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8
Mar-May	Children's rights and digital technologies	5	600	27	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8
Oct-July	Thesis International Children's Rights	10	600	20 (excl. thesis trajectory)	2, 3, 4, 5 and 8
<b>Final total</b>		<b>60</b>		<b>289</b>	<b>ALL</b>

### Appendix 3: Documents studied

The panel studied a wide selection of documents relating to the programme's profile and intended learning outcomes, its teaching-learning environment, assessment and end level.

These included:

- Self-assessment report (including a student chapter)
- Course files of:
  - Interaction Between Children's Rights and Other International Legal Systems
  - Children in the Justice System
  - Migration and Children's Rights
- Master's theses of fifteen graduates
- NVAO recommendations 2018 and changes
- Course Descriptions and Assessments (Academic Year 2023/2024)
- Course Schedule Overview
- Student Statistics and Enrolment 2018 -2023 including Enrolment versus Graduation Rates 2018 -2023
- Overview of Teaching Staff – (Academic Year 2023/2024) including staff C.V.'s
- Benchmarking report for like programmes national and international
- Programme Vision and Development
- Subject Specific Reference Framework and Learning Outcomes of the Programme Course Levels
- Thesis Guidelines
- Rules and Regulations (Academic Year 2023/2024)
- Mid Term Review Report
- Mid Term Plan of Action
- Exam Commission Annual Report 2022- 2023
- PAC Reports 2022 - 2023

## Appendix 4: Site visit schedule

### February 27, 2024

14.00 – 16.00 Online meeting panel with Faculty Boards and Management of Leiden Law School and Faculty of Governance and Global Affairs

### March 4, 2024

17.00 – 19.00 Kick-off meeting panel

### March 5, 2024

#### Humanities programmes

09.00 – 10.00 Meeting with the programme management Humanities programmes (EIHRL, ICR, PIL)

10.05 – 11.05 Meetings with students and alumni Humanities programmes (EIHRL, ICR, PIL)

11.15 – 12.15 Meeting with lecturers Humanities programmes (EIHRL, ICR, PIL)

12.15 – 13.15 Lunch

#### International Relations

13.15 – 14.00 Meeting with the programme management MIRD programme

14.15 – 15.00 Meeting with students and alumni MIRD programme

15.15 – 16.00 Meeting with lecturers MIRD programme

16.00 – 17.00 Panel meeting on preliminary findings Humanities (EIHRL, ICR, PIL) and MIRD programmes

### March 6, 2024

#### Business programmes

08.45 – 09.45 Meeting with the programme management Business programmes (EIBL, ICCL L&F)

10.00 – 11.00 Meetings with students and alumni Business programmes (EIBL, ICCL L&F)

11.15 – 12.15 Meeting with lecturers Business programmes (EIBL, ICCL L&F)

12.15 – 13.00 Panel meeting on preliminary findings Business programmes (EIBL, ICCL L&F)

13.00 – 14.30 Development dialogue including lunch (two sessions with two questions per session)

#### Multidisciplinary programmes

15.00 – 16.00 Meeting with the programme management multidisciplinary programmes (A&SL, IDSA, L&DT)

16.15 – 17.15 Meeting with students and alumni multidisciplinary programmes (A&SL, IDSA, L&DT)

17.15 – 18.15 Meeting with lecturers multidisciplinary programmes (A&SL, IDSA, L&DT)

18.15 – 18.45 Panel meeting on preliminary findings multidisciplinary programmes (A&SL, IDSA, L&DT)

### March 7, 2024

09.00 – 09.30 Panel meeting

09.30 – 10.45 Meeting with Exam Commission and Programme Advisory Committee (LLS/FGGA)

10.45 – 11.30 Panel meeting: preparation final meeting with management

11.30 – 12.15 Meeting with management

12.15 – 13.00 Lunch

13.00 – 16.30 Panel meeting: preliminary findings /judgments all programmes

16.30 – 17.00 Feedback panel on preliminary findings

17.00 End of site visit